

# US Presidential Elections Stolen by Foreign Powers

[Jett Rucker](#)

Two US presidential elections are documented as having been stolen by foreign powers. In fact, both elections were stolen by the same power: Great Britain—the very regime, independence from which the American Revolution supposedly was fought. And its agenda was the same both times: to draw the US into a conflict with Germany on its own side, in what thereby became World Wars I and II. The second time, the conflict also with Japan was but more-helpful, in respect of Britain’s colonies in Singapore, Malaya, Burma and Hong Kong. America’s own colonies in the Philippines and Hawaii, of course, dovetailed nicely with the colonies of other imperial powers besides Britain such as France (Indochina) and the Netherlands (Indonesia). They all had had things quite nicely divided up until upstart Japan butted in with its own imperial ambitions.

Today, we hear Russia has manipulated the recent US presidential contest. If so, would Russia’s agenda include drawing the US into some war in an alliance with Russia? Despite “hot spots” in Syria, Russia does not seem to be involved in any wars against enemies so formidable as Germany was to Britain in the Twentieth-Century conflicts. So, IF Russia manipulated the election (effectively, rather than just having a preference as to its outcome), any war involved must lie in the future. Or, NOT in the future. It’s at least imaginable that the future war on the minds of today’s leaders of Russia might involve the US. And perhaps that is a/the war those leaders might wish to avoid. Perhaps they mean to pursue World Domination while the US abstains from war against Russia. Or, perhaps they might want peace with a United States that itself abjures its own plans for World Dominations.

All this is any voter’s guess, to weigh against alternatives (hijacked, not hijacked, foreign or domestic) according to his own lights. The present essay is to make it clear that hijacking of US presidential elections is anything but unprecedented. In fact, the two British enterprises here discussed are most unlikely to have been the only ones, nor Britain by any means the only hijacker.

My emphasis will fall on the later example, that of World War II, but the one of 1916, the re-election of Woodrow “He Kept Us out of War” Wilson, bears mention if only because the hijacker was the same one as in 1940, and its main adversary, Germany, was the same. The earlier example seems to have been exerted on the US with the greatest assistance of Zionism. Thomas Dalton, writing in *Inconvenient History*,<sup>[1]</sup> is one of many who have amply documented the agencies through which American Zionists such as Felix Frankfurter exerted pressure on President Wilson to condemn Germany and, ultimately, to win the declaration of war on Germany in 1917 that Britain’s Lord Balfour bought with his infamous Balfour Declaration of Britain’s willingness to impose a Jewish homeland on Palestine. With his arrangement to have the *Lusitania* torpedoed by a German submarine in 1915, of course, Winston Churchill wins a solid Supporting Actor award in this conspiracy to slaughter untold millions of Americans, Germans, and other hapless innocents.

Also re-elected on a slogan of “No American Boys ...” was Franklin D. Roosevelt, in 1940, also by dispositive foreign influence exerted by (the same) European power in a desperate struggle of its own making against Germany. Ironically in view of the explicitly anti-Jewish agenda of Germany’s National Socialist regime at the time, Jewish agency seems to be less obvious in this instance of British treachery than it was in the 1916 example of Woodrow Wilson. But the toll on the blood and treasure of the

United States was every bit as awful. Perhaps the agency of Jews was better-concealed. It is of no concern in this analysis.

The clearest description of Britain's hijacking of the 1940 election (hardly a year before the US became a belligerent in World War II on December 7, 1941) appears in Thomas E. Mahl's 1998 book *Desperate Deception*, in which the entire British effort to enlist the active support of the US in its contest with Germany is documented.[\[2\]](#)

The British hijacking occurred not in the general election, as the allegations concerning the 2016 election seem to run, but in the process before the primary elections, in which the candidate of the Republican Party to oppose incumbent Franklin Roosevelt (a very "safe" friend of Britain) in the general election. The leading contender for this nomination was Robert A. Taft, who not only was "soft" on prosecuting the war then underway, to the point of annihilating (a process now called "regime change") Germany and Japan, but just as bad, was an opponent of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal. Such a Republican candidate would not only offer American voters a choice, but it would offer them a choice that British agents correctly judged inimical to their own country's war aims.

His Majesty's men managed things most-effectively. They torpedoed Taft's bid, and arranged for a previously unknown Democrat-just-Turned-Republican named Wendell Willkie to capture the nomination. Not only was Willkie a most-dubious sort of candidate to attract the votes of Republicans, he further was foursquare in favor of continued vigorous prosecution of what some Americans still felt was a war for the benefit of, and instigated by, Perfidious Albion. It was, in every way, a "can't lose" proposition for the British *agents provocateurs*.

How did they do such a thing, without attracting the penetrating attentions of the CIA, as Trump's recent coup has (not) done? For one thing, of course, there was no CIA in 1940; there was only the FBI, and for whatever reason, it seemed not, as in 2016, to involve itself in electoral matters, or at least not visibly so. But Britain's own CIA, the vaunted MI6, was evidently at the time most active, and most effective, rather like the latter-day British agent James Bond.

The start was a conspiracy involving the incumbent (Democrat) president of the US. One (J. P. Morgan banker) Thomas W. Lamont, the Jewish pundit Walter Lippmann and the British ambassador to the US Philip Kerr (Lord Lothian) conspired to catapult the renegade Willkie, himself utterly innocent of prior political experience, to the candidacy. Willkie, who had joined the Republican Party less than a year before his candidacy, was a strong proponent of the policy of all possible military and economic aid to Britain and France in their war with Germany. Strange and wonderful indeed are those processes that some are pleased to call "democracy" from which emerge those personalities who ultimately wield such enormous powers over the minds and hearts of those who imagine that they live, and die, under the edicts of the gods who reign under the divine mantle bearing the name of "the will of the people."

But how, then, was this divine mantle so purloined? It involved, among other things, what might be called electronic hacking, decades before the advent of computers for tallying votes. At the convention, former President Herbert Hoover gave a speech strongly advocating the disfavored "isolationist" line of thought, but a "mole" of the Willkie candidacy named Sam Pryor arranged for Hoover's microphone to malfunction, such that very few could even hear his speech. A subsequent speech by Hoover in the lobby of the convention hotel in Philadelphia was drowned out by the happenstance arrival of a drum and bugle corps at just the minute when he took the floor.

Pryor, having displaced the original coordinator of the convention, one Ralph E. Williams, who favored the leading candidate, Robert Taft, had a duplicate set of passes to the convention's gallery printed up and distributed these to hand-picked shills who at appropriate moments set up a deafening chant of "We want Willkie." Senator Arthur Vandenberg, a candidate commanding at one point over seven percent of the delegates, resigned after five votes had been taken and threw his delegates' votes to Willkie, who won on the sixth vote. Vandenberg's bed (and marriage) had been penetrated by a female British agent named Mitzi Sims, who was the wife of a staffer at the British Embassy in Washington. Willkie's upset nomination left American voters who opposed US involvement in World War II with no more of a choice than American voters who oppose military aid to Israel had in 2016 between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump.

- 
- [1] Dalton, Thomas. "The Jewish Hand in the World Wars" Part 1. *Inconvenient History*, Vol. 5, No. 2.  
See [http://inconvenienthistory.com/archive/2013/volume\\_5/number\\_2/the\\_jewish\\_hand\\_in\\_the\\_world\\_wars.php](http://inconvenienthistory.com/archive/2013/volume_5/number_2/the_jewish_hand_in_the_world_wars.php)
- [2] This book also provides a fascinating reference (p. 15) to a project of one Eric Maschwitz to provide fake atrocity photographs made in Canada with actors wearing captured German uniforms. The author, upon receiving an inquiry from me on the potential implications of this plot, rather pooh-pooed them. Conceivably, he still has something of a career ahead of him. Or his children might ...

<b>Author(s):</b>	<a href="#">Jett Rucker</a>
<b>Title:</b>	US Presidential Elections Stolen by Foreign Powers
<b>Sources:</b>	<i>Inconvenient History</i> , 9(1) 2017
<b>Dates:</b>	published: 2017-02-05, first posted: 2017-02-06 01:08:38

<http://inconvenienthistory.com/9/1/4213>